

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 13 has been identified as being allowable. The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowability. Claim 13 remains unchanged and remains allowable.

II. Amendments to the Claims

Independent claims 1, 14 and 15 have been amended to further distinguish the claimed invention from the Nakano reference. Specifically, independent claims 1, 14 and 15 have been amended to require that the index information output unit is operable to output, in response to the request for the index information, only the index information converted by the video processing unit to cause the display apparatus to display the converted index information.

III. Claim Objection

Claim 15 was objected to for reciting “outputting the only.” Claim 15 has been amended to recited “outputting only the,” as kindly suggested by the Examiner. As a result, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

Claims 1-8, 10, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Nakano and Takashima. This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable

to independent claims 1 and 14 and 15 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a content reproduction apparatus including an instruction receiving unit that receives an instruction for outputting index information that indicates a device key. Moreover, claim 1 recites that the content reproduction apparatus includes an index information output unit that, based on the instruction, outputs only the converted index information to cause the display apparatus to display the index information converted by the video processing unit into a format displayable on the screen of the display apparatus.

Independent claim 14 recites a related method, and independent claim 15 recites a related computer-readable recording medium having a program recorded thereon. Nakano and Takashima, or any combination thereof, fails to disclose or suggest that above-mentioned distinguishing limitations recited in independent claims 1, 14 and 15.

Rather, Nakano, which was relied upon for teaching the above-mentioned “converted index information,” teaches that a device key assignment unit 103 outputs device key identification information to a recording apparatus 200 to be recorded onto a recording medium 500a (see paragraphs [0193] and [0213]-[0216]; and Figs. 8 and 10).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Nakano teaches that the identification information is output to a recording medium, but fails to disclose or suggest that the index information output unit outputs only the converted index information to cause the display apparatus to display the index information converted by the video processing unit into a format displayable on the screen of the display apparatus, as recited in claim 1.

In other words, Nakano teaches that the identification information is created to be recorded onto a recording medium, but fails to disclose or suggest that the index information is converted to cause a display apparatus to display the converted index information, as required by claim 1.

Now turning to Takashima, Applicants note that Takashima was relied upon for suggesting displaying the index information on a display device. However, according to Nakano, the identification information is not for being displayed, but is rather for being recorded onto a recording medium. As a result, the Applicants submit that, even though Takashima teaches displaying information, Takashima merely teaches displaying information intended to be displayed and does not suggest that the identification information for recording, as disclosed by Nakano, is for being displayed. In other words, Takashima cannot be relied upon for suggesting that the identification information disclosed by Nakano is displayed on a display apparatus.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claims 1, 14 and 15 and claims 2-8 and 10 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from the any combination of Nakano and Takashima.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Nakano and/or Takashima or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakano and/or Takashima to obtain the invention of independent claim 1, 14 and 15. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 14 and 15 and claims 2-8 and 10 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaoru YOKOTA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2010.03.18 11:55:57 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 18, 2010